

**AFW-9 Comments**  
**Recommendation 46**  
**Improved management and restoration of existing stands**

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.

"Engage in private sector markets"??? Government should absolutely not get involved in private sector markets.

Let the private markets go forward.

How do you define productive? Simply growing trees or forests or the harvest of the same?

Education is ok, if conducted in a cost effective manner.

I cannot support this carbon sequestration idea otherwise this sounds good.

Spend the money on infrastructure and training workers to transition to renewable energy and to becoming efficient in building and ways to be self-sufficient/efficient in energy

policies on federal land have reduced both health and productivity - let's learn from their bad policy and make our state and private lands both healthy and productive, in a way that enhances, rather than degrades, our environment!

This is completely out of scope. Hopefully decision-makers are starting to get the picture here. Proposed solutions to alleged AGW is the portal to complete control - nothing is out-of-scope to these ideologists. This is misleading. What is your definition of productivity - Carbon reduction?

Remove the subsidies, and they will have to make the right decisions.

Are the environmental community going to embrace this proposal??

Pressure the U.S Congress to require the National Forests to resume active management and sales of timber to reimburse the National Treasury. By active management the wildfire (release of carbon) would be alleviated and reduce to horrific costs of suppression and loss of a renewable energy resource.

Not if the increased productivity equals increased logging.

Too little too late

how do you increase forest productivity on long-lived species?

individuals can only do so much with this issue, we need strong and numerous government action of many forms and formats...

The science of Forestry tells us that forest productivity increases are best met through stand density and structure management(logging).Conversion of stagnant old growth stands to vigorous second growth brings about a huge increase in basal area production and subsequent carbon sequestration.I don't think expanded programs and/or technical assistance can bring about the increases projected.Most of the private forest lands have seen extensive management in the past decade due to the down turn in federal harvests. If you're suggesting a major tree planting effort across previously harvested and other suitable private forest lands, you're talking about a very expensive effort. Labor and seedlings can easily run \$100 per acre.

Good luck. DNRC is cutting them down faster than you can plant them.

Look to the UN-intended consequences. Let the market do it's job. Like most government involvement in an issue, it is well intentioned, but will ultimately make the situation more cumbersome and expensive.

Forget "productivity": save the remaining forests. They've been "managed" to death for private profit under the guise of "forest health". It's a cynical scam.

Should be doing this presently

Does management mean logging???

This sounds like clear cutting. old growth forests are the healthiest, and least carbon-producing stands out there. Manage for old growth. i.e hands off.

Allow increased cutting of timber for lumber and reducing of fireload in our forests. Allowing aging stands of timber to die of old age, disease or fire is not wise use of the resource.

I fail to see how "new practices that increase tree density" are going to "decrease the chances of biomass loss from fires, pests, and disease." This sounds a lot like more hand outs to the timber industry disguised to look like carbon sequestration laws.

Increase forest productivity? With fertilisers, that are reliant on petroleum products? No.

Does increased productivity mean increased timber harvest and replanting? If so mark this one "5".

Who is going to pay for the roads?

Especially important for this initiative to include continuously improving management practices to fully support stream protection and maintenance of stand biodiversity and mixed tree ages (including snags to support wildlife diversity).

people can educate themselves.

I'm not buying the whole carbon sequestration market thing.

this should not promulgate cutting "old growth" forests

Depends on impacts of strategy. Sounds like a logging subsidy.

Too many trees now in many places=fire=carbon released. Maybe need to focus more on reduction of carbon production than this item. Examples: using a clothes line instead of a dryer reduces by (so many) tons of carbon in an average home; low flow shower heads; all that stuff easily gotten to public repeatedly might be pretty darn productive.

And don't cut down any trees.

**EDUCATE ON THE DANGERS OF USING PESTICIDES ALSO. YOU ALWAYS LEAVE THAT OUT.**

interesting but it doesn't seem like there's much agreement about how to manage our lands...at least there's a lot of disagreement between foresters and environmentalists...and even my forestry management friends admit there's much they do not know about land management from a big picture point of view.

it is back to where the public is paying the bills again for the private sector

Can we increase logging by 10% - please?

Not for GHG purposes. No to supporting carbon trading markets. Clearly there is no consensus on any benefit to GHG reduction. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

Enhance and expand programs....how much money will that take? There is much to be learned and dealt with before carbon sequestration should be encouraged.

AS LONG AS WE ARE ALSO HARVESTING THE INCREASED PRODUCTION. OTHERWISE WE ARE JUST STOCKING UP FOR EVER LARGER FOREST FIRES.

Forests should be managed for ecosystem health.

At what cost in fuel consumption?

State forests need to be managed better for long-term forest health and productivity. Too many stands that were previously logged are in need of precommercial thinning, but this often is a low priority because it's a long-term investment that doesn't produce income. This may be a violation of the trust mandate to preserve the long-term productivity and corpus of the trust.

Support - but do not engage

don't just think about productivity, think about forest health for All species

We need more forests to use up the excess CO2.

I support restoration, but not projects like the state's big old-growth timber sale up on the Swan State Forest.

The state should also encourage these activities on federal forest lands.

MONtana should also take the lead at the Federal level and manage our federal forests. Make the frivolous lawsuits and never ending environmental NEPA process a thing of the past. Our Governor would make the idea guy to lead the war on NEPA.

What do you mean increase forest productivity? This sounds a little like "improvements to land" which is an oxymoron. If you mean slice and dice more of our forest you're crazy, we need trees not lumber. Remember trees provide oxygen and take in CO2, that is huge to remember here. Lumber is just a little reminder of the oxygen you will no longer be able to breath in, and the resulting CO2 we now have to deal with. Leave the trees alone, when will we get it? The trees are the cooling part of the equation, get them in the ground, leave them in the ground, make sure they get water and protection AGAIN GET THE TREES IN THE GROUND AND LEAVE THEM THERE. Oh and don't forget other sources for paper, banana trees, coco fiber, hemp, hemp grows four times faster than trees and has a multitude of uses, one being the paper used for our US Constitution.

Why only 700,000 acres?

As long as harvest practices on this land are part of the equation.

Be clear: what do you mean by productivity? If you mean "ability to harvest" that is one thing, and I don't support his. If you mean increase ability to sequester carbon naturally, I wholeheartedly support.

why not 100% forest production, eliminate the greenies

only on state land, private owners should be given a financial gain on timber that was paid for by tax payers

forget carbon crap.

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states.

<http://www.righttalk.com/asx/ggws.asx>

must allow logging for a healthy forest!

Concerned that this would be a tool used to infringe upon the State and the private citizens of Montana to get the best benefit from the renewable resources on these lands. See comment on AFW-8

The State can increase productivity on its lands, but on private land that is the land owners responsibility. An again I smell and incentive coming grab your wallets folks its another incentive.

This would a "5" if you include the Federal Forests and lands. You MUST force the feds to meet their management mandates. Fraud Waste and Abuse by wasting our states natural resources through their NO Management LET IT BURN policy. These federal lands should be managed by the state. The federal lands and their negative management is a detriment to the states and private lands in the state. The insects, diseases, fires, poor water quality(erosion), wolves and cost to rural communities (apathy) makes the US Forest Service the biggest liability to the State of Montana. Our Governor could do something, but it might put a kink in the political ladder he is trying to climb. Meanwhile the state flounders. Ask the enviro's what they will let you do.

This appears to be in direct conflict with wilderness preservation and habitat conservation.

In order to increase productivity by anything, some of the trees growing (and dead and dying) need to be removed. Again, where did the 20% on 700,000 acres of private and state land appear?

Would like to know what management practices mean. To some that means no logging to others it means wise use. Should be defined

This would seem to indicate that proper management will be pursued.

Would like to know what management practices mean. To some that means no logging to others it means wise use. Should be defined

no tree farms.

Don't increase productivity at the expense of other ecosystem values associated with forests.

It's questionable how well this method will sequester carbon in the high latitudes of Montana.

DO IT.

As long as the forests are managed properly, and not closed off

Good idea.

If "management" is accomplished by current practice of slashing and burning small diameter trees in the understory then this program could contribute to global warming.

What do you mean "forest productivity". And you know my apprehension about carbon sequestration. We don't have the water supply for this.

Not sure whose interests are being advanced here.

Again, approach this potential with caution, lest it prove less workable than assumed.

need to put the loggers back to work in the woods. they put fires out right away to protect their products, and at no cost to the public. When you pay people to fight fires they don't want to put them out because then they'd be out of work, instead they light backfires to keep it burning. need to open all gated roads to get to the fires quicker.

Manage trees for ecosystem and forest health, not carbon sequestration. If these two goals align, so much the better. This should not be the primary goal of our forests.

again, Carbon fearmongering.

develop clearer goals. what exactly does "improved management" mean?

Increased production should be done in concert with improving wildlife habitat, too. Not just to add more trees for carbon sequestration.

I don't understand the concept of carbon sequestration very well. What is it in lay terms?

A healthy forest doesn't necessarily maximize carbon sequestration. Final report could be more clear.

Increase forest harvesting and production....but mostly harvesting, it is ridiculous to allow our forests to just burn.

Forest products that are harvested and used in construction are "sequestered" for at least as long as the structure lasts. Even newspaper in a landfill is sequestered for a century or longer.

Why do we need to manage all the forests? For millions of years they have managed just fine without us. What do you mean by forest productivity?

You're throwing two things together. We agree that forests should be harvested regularly and restocked, however, we believe the carbon sequestration is only a feel-good attempt at solving the GHG issue.

I favor natural processes in our forests.

This way too low of levels over way too much time. The need is now.

Will the timber resource be used or will non-development groups stop this, too.

There needs to be more public education about carbon sequestration.

I'm in favor if we allow proper logging as a part of this if not then it is not a long term solution.

Trees don't help GHG reduction if they're cut. Thinning of dog-hair stuff OK

Scientific theories on global warming do not warrant new taxes or legislation. Need additional analysis to understand impact on consumers and penalties on business development.

Ok but bigger fish to fry!

As a former Forest Service Employee, who ran thinning crews I know that by taking out the sick and diseased and dead and stunted trees we opened up the forest and the trees grew faster, healthier and the fire danges was less. Lets get back to good forest management. And don't spend money on carbon sequestrqion, the treed need the cabon to grow. Besides it's a waste of money.

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Too costly.

All these programs, whether needed or not, adds to the number of employees used by the State. This adds to the need for more taxes. The cycle goes on without need or success.

Yes !!!

State lands are "suppose" to be managed the best possible now. I can see not need of passing another law, just enforce the ones we have on State lands. The carbon issue is a farce, leave it alone.

All of these are 'feel good' expensive bulls\*\*t legislation. Global warming is NOT a fact (cold records set last winter in the southern hemisphere) so it might be Northern hemisphere warming, but not global. Secondly, latest studies of the sun spots (that control global temperatures more than humans) indicate that within 20 years we will be back in a 'mini-ice age'. Not politically correct, but MUCH more accurate.

Again, manage the forest before the fires.

Forget the stupid sequestration !!!!! The technology is already available. Just needs implementing. Start up money may be needed for infra-structure and plants.

More money for brainwashing. Give it a break.

**MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING IS BASED ON JUNK SCIENCE. PLEASE DO THE RESEARCH AND DON'T STEAL FROM THE PUBLIC THAT YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT!**

Why don't you include promoting the harvesting of timber and thinning so that the carbon in that wood will be sequestered in house construction, furniture, etc? Seems a bit hypocritical here.

**WHO PAYS FOR THIS**

Will this increase or decrease the price of materails? Can and should we be mandating private sector use of land?

Improved forest management is a worthy goal for many reasons, most importantly fire prevention. Montana forest fires probably release more carbon dioxide than can be reduced by all of the draconian measures considered here. Carbon sequestration is a scam that will make a lot of middlemen a lot of money with little or no benefit.

is this for the reforestation or another tricky way of clearcutting?

Need to focus more on noxious weeds also to help maintain ecosystem health

What does this mean???

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN???

What are the ecological implications of this recommendation?

Does this include control burns to limit fire danger. It should.

Excellent.

For years it seemed like logging was one of the main enemies of environmentalist, it seems funny, in an odd way that now they're espousing logging. Just get out of the way & let the loggers & lumber companies define what management plan would give us best forest health, they know what they're doing.

What is it about carbon that makes the world community think it's so important? It's fart! let a tree or shrub live and open a window!

No support for big rich lumber companies with taxpayer dollars.

Professional forest managers should determine correct percentages.

Leave this part out. "Support and engage in private sector markets for carbon sequestration." Let the private sector do the "marketing"

This is too slow, it must begin soon and reach goals sooner.

Depends on what you mean by improved management

Fear "improved management" is a euphemism for cutting old trees to replace them with young trees.

Excellent. Also work with Federal agencies, FS, BLM, FWS, BIA, Indian Reservations, Military to implement this program. Manage for old growth and diversified stands of trees. Manage ponderosa pine forests for open space, with grass understories.

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

The forests are producing many times over the amount of timber that is being harvested now. Let the forest service manage our forests, not a bunch of so-called environmentalists.

Fine, except the Wall Street pukes will be the winners.

Great! but also must be done on Federal ownership.

It's a nice idea, but is it realistic? Have professional foresters been asked to weigh-in on this proposal?

I can support this proposal provided "forest productivity" means increased timber harvests as part of restoration activities.

I don't agree it is wise to fund carbon sequestration or that there is even a viable need for it.

Probably an unrealistic goal that cannot be met without fertilizer and irrigation.

Hopefully, the increased productivity would mean future sustainable harvest of wood products.

let the logging industry cut and replant

Don't care for the carbon markets.

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation.

Must be able to harvest forests not just plant them for sequestration

What is the definition of increased productivity? Is it more money for timber companies, or greater carbon sequestering?

would these stands then be logged and what would the net carbon captured be... If not logged sounds like a great idea.

Good concept if productivity increase is through silvicultural prescriptions involving COMMERCIAL harvest.

The private forests are currently better managed than US lands. Reduce the legal system blockages of harvest of bugged and old timber.

Lame. what would not be lame would be to demand more logging on Usfs and BLM lands.

Please eliminate the mountain pine beetles. They are killing our forests in Montana.

The real opportunity here is to address forest health issues by treating fire-prone stands.

1/3 of Montana is publicly owned. An effort to benefit the public as a whole, should also incorporate the federal acreage in Montana for maximum effectiveness.